



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A. D. 922. Civil war and foreign invasion followed each other, and famine, sword, and fire brought insufferable miseries upon us, until we came to hate war, to love peace, and to despise a soldier. . . . By the end of the first half of the 19th century there was not one gentleman (or educated man, which in my country means the same thing) in our army. A soldier in the eyes of the Chinese citizen soon became no better than a dog that is employed to watch a house. 'No good man would be a soldier, no good iron would be a nail,' is the popular proverb."

The causes which brought about this change are significant. The writer points out that the change was due, in the first instance, to Confucianism. "Confucius, who saw the horrors of war as waged in his time by the ruling princes against each other, preached again and again that 'a wise king should always win his enemy over by goodness and not by force.'" Ever since the ascendancy of Confucianism the national sentiment of anti-militarism advanced, and military glory disappeared altogether from the history of China.

"Another powerful endorsement of anti-militarism was Buddhism, which spread over the country from the eighth century." It was a more powerful anti-military force even than Confucius, for it did not confine itself to the upper class. It won over the entire female population, and through them exercised a powerful influence against militarism. Many writers in the twelfth century who were the sternest Confucianists had unconsciously inherited Buddhism from their mothers, although they denounced it as false and heretic.

The writer concludes by urging his readers "to arouse the latent military spirit of our people and prepare, not

merely to meet the enemy in the gate, but to rally forth and disperse him on the open field. We are not in a position to subscribe to the vulgar distich, 'We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do, we've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the money, too,' but we can certainly subscribe whole-heartedly to the first sentence of it. The question is, Are we to prepare ourselves, to put ourselves into a position to be able sincerely and without boasting to subscribe to the whole couplet? The answer depends very largely on the conduct of our neighbors toward us."

From the foregoing it will be noticed that hitherto the powerful forces in China working against militarism have been Confucianism and Buddhism, but we are now face to face with the fact that both of these are fast losing their hold upon New China, and that materialism is making more headway than Christianity. Confucianism and Buddhism are believed, by an ever-growing number, to have developed the anti-militarism of China. The trend of events in China at the present time is fraught with much danger for the future. The army is already as large as is the Japanese; conscription is being pressed for by men in high position. The soldier is becoming popular, and military schools and arsenals are being established all over the land. The student class which are the hope of China, believe that there is no salvation for their country except by following the example of Europe and arming themselves to the teeth.

This condition should constitute a strong call to friends of peace everywhere to make haste to save China from what is ruining Europe today!

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

A LETTER FROM GUSTAV SPILLER

GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ETHICAL SOCIETIES, LONDON

SIR: THE ABOVE is the thought-provoking title of a new and influential organization formed in the United States, whose intention, to judge solely by this superscription, is to force the gates of the Kingdom of Peace. We are at once enticed to imagine sundry large and small powers issuing a proclamation to the effect that he who shall dare to break the world's peace shall himself be remorselessly broken. Involuntarily we begin to ask ourselves who these altruistic modern knight-errants are likely to be and what are the prospects of their cowering or felling the enemies of mankind.

On examining the "platform" of this league, our enthusiasm is changed to keen disappointment, for, as so often happens with titles, they suggest visions and cloak feeble compromises. The league's object, in plain language, is not at all to enforce peace. Nations need not identify themselves with the league, in which case it will be unconcerned whether they war or not, nor does the league place any obstacles in the way of its members feloniously falling on non-signatory powers. The nations which do join the league are expected to retain their armies and navies, and may unrebuked plunge into war with signatory powers, provided they first burn a few grains of incense by satisfying certain formalities. In other words, when a difference between members of the league cannot be disposed of by negotiation, they must

give a few months' notice before they sound the gong of war, unless, indeed, they circumvent the demands made on them.

The league is solely concerned with signatory powers. Should a dispute of a justiciable character arise between any of these, it must be "submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment;" but once the judgment is delivered, the parties to the dispute may apply cold steel to the solution.

In respect of non-justiciable questions, the arrangement proposed is that these should be "submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration, and recommendation." This recommendation the parties to the dispute are at liberty to ignore, and a declaration of war may ensue promptly without the league having a right to intervene, or even protest.

Should, however, any of the signatory powers attack any of their fellow signatory powers without submitting their dispute to the competent authorities or waiting for the decision or recommendation, then "the signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces" against the offending party or parties.

Lastly, occasional conferences between the signatory powers are to be held for the purpose of formulating and codifying rules of international law.

Observe, now, the difficulties involved in this scheme. Almost everything in the league's plan hinges on promptly determining which party to the dispute is responsible for the opening of hostilities. In the present world conflagration Germany contends that Russia and France were the aggressors; Turkey, that the initiative was Russia's, and Bulgaria, that the blame lies upon Serbia. Needless to say, and for very good reasons, these charges are indignantly repudiated by the powers against whom they are brought. To express this differently, by ingenuous self-deception or audacious prevarication the culprit may render it impossible to determine who is guilty pending a protracted inquiry, and such a deadlock, which is almost certain to occur, would prove absolutely fatal to the league's primary intentions.

Moreover, suppose there is delay of six months. In practice this would only signify, in conformity with the current rules of diplomatic procedure, that six months before contemplating hostilities an inquiry would be demanded and heaven and earth moved to confuse the issue before the tribunal or council. Since our modern wars are not traceable to the errors and the passions of the peoples themselves, the lapse of half a year would be immaterial. As to the particular judgment promulgated, this may be conveniently denounced as biased, and thus be airily brushed aside. He who is living through this war with ears open will scarcely doubt that diplomacy, or the diplomacy of certain countries, would be equal to the task of making white appear black and black white, and in this manner defeat the moral object of the inquiry.

A still graver objection may be raised against the proposed league. Prior to the war there was a feverish increase in armaments and, as concomitants, growing intrigues, numerous alliances, wholesale espionage, suspicion, and estrangement between countries, and frequent international crises. Now it may be fairly urged that in the present anarchic condition of international politics a continuous augmentation of armaments is inevitable, and that, in turn, this continuous augmentation leads inevitably to crises and wars. How could it be otherwise? The nation's safety must be secured at all costs, and when this safety depends on armaments, rivalry is unavoidable, and so are alliances, plotting, spying, distrust, and attempts to forestall menacing possibilities. In earlier days science and international interests constituted a negligible quantity, and a balancing of forces and claims was comparatively easy. Today this is out of the question. Nearly every nation has interests in almost every region of the globe, and the novelties of science represent the great and much-dreaded military X. Think of the far-reaching influence on the war of the unsuspected German 42 cm. guns and other abominations such as suffocating gases and Zeppelins, or of the unexpected part played by submarines! Any day, therefore, a new invention may suddenly secure the military ascendancy of some particular power. Accordingly, there is in our scientific age no meaning in what is called the limitation of armaments, which can only refer to quantity and not to quality nor to new inventions or applications; and hence nothing—absolutely nothing—remains except to choose between a breathless race in armaments and consequent war and disarmament pure and simple and law and peace. He who confronts the facts unflinchingly and rejects speculations born of despair will be unable to escape from this dilemma.

The arch fallacy which intimidates the promoters of the league and many others is that we cannot hope to abolish war save by degrees, and that at all events our generation is not prepared to proceed to such lengths. As we have shown, States will not and cannot compromise their safety, and no compromise will therefore be accepted by States. Whilst war threatens from any quarter, be it even from a peace league or a so-called international police, States will insist on being fully equipped for all contingencies—that is, they will insist on protecting themselves by improved armaments, alliances, etc., and will secretly or openly flout all platonic commissions of inquiry, law courts expressing only pious opinions, arbitration courts aiming at compromise and not at justice, councils of conciliation with their impotent recommendations, disingenuous distinctions between justiciable and non-justiciable matters, undemocratic legislatures, *et hoc omne genus*. Once, however, disarmament is general and a proper international legislature and court of law are instituted, suspicion and anxiety will automatically depart, aggressive intentions will not suggest themselves because of complete military unpreparedness, and States will as little desire armies and navies as towns and provinces do today. A great city like London or New York does not command a *single* soldier or a *single* cannon nor dreams of the possibility of being attacked by neighboring localities, and there is no reason why countries should be in a different position. Economic, moral, and other non-military arguments would then become convincing in national as in local affairs, as I have explained in a previous communication.* In any case, it should be remembered that there is but one alternative—full-blown militarism with war or disarmament with international law. It is a perilous delusion to imagine that war can be abolished by stages. All that is likely to occur is that we may have to fight another world war before we recognize this momentous truth.

However, it is urged that the peoples of the world are opposed to reform through revolution. I do not believe this for a moment. The peoples are only too eager for a reign of peace, provided it can be attained without jeopardizing the sovereignty and individuality of their country. If we convinced them that disarmament is essential to peace, and that in its absence war will continue to decimate and dehumanize man as well as to wreck our civilization, they would willingly support the demand, especially since they are habituated to the paramountcy of law in national and local affairs. In the twinkling of an eye, so to speak, the long and bitter feud between French and English was transformed into a cordial entente as the result of diplomatic conversations, and an arrangement which truly secured permanent peace would be hailed with frantic joy by the peoples of the earth, even though, or perhaps because, it was a revolutionary one.

Let us have done, then, with futile compromises which disregard the stern and unwelcome realities of life, and let us invite, or even command, our statesmen to turn their eyes to the sun and lead us out of the inferno of war, with its nameless and shameless horrors and degradations.

*The Foundations of Permanent Peace, printed in the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, No. 5, May, 1915.